



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/128,244	08/03/1998	LAWRENCE J. ELLISON	233/038	2416

7590 02/03/2004

DEREK J WESTBERG  
LAW OFFICES OF DEREK J WESTBERG  
TWO NORTH SECOND STREET SUITE 1390  
SAN JOSE, CA 95113

EXAMINER
----------

DINH, DUNG C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2153

DATE MAILED: 02/03/2004

24

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/128,244

Applicant(s)

ELLISON ET AL.

Examiner

Dung Dinh

Art Unit

2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 29 and 80-159 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 92-110 and 132-150 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 29,80-91,111-131 and 151-159 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 2153

**DETAILED ACTION**

Applicant's election of claims 29, 80-91, 111-119, 120-131 and 151-159 for examination is noted. Claims 92-110, 132-150 are withdrawn from consideration.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

*A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --*

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

**Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ramasubramanian et al. US patent 6,172,672.**

Regarding claim 29, Ramasubramanian discloses a system for sending improved quality of streaming video data to a client, comprising the steps of: sending a video stream to said client in accordance with a set of streaming constraints, said video stream comprising at least a subset of video information from a first source (fig.1B, element 134); receiving a signal indicating a relaxation of said streaming constraints (col.6

Art Unit: 2153

line 25 - col.7 line 12); in response to said signal, accessing a set of improved quality video from a second source (fig.1B, element 140), said improved quality video information comprising an improved quality version of at least a subset of the video information in said video stream, wherein said improved quality video information includes a plurality of still images (a video stream is composed of frames, each frame being a single still image, also see col.8 lines 29-34 - the process described can be repeated to provide multiple copies of an image in the JPEG, PCX, BMP, TIFF, etc. formats); and sending said set of improved quality video information to said client (col.6 line 25 - col.7 line 12).

**Claims 80- are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ludwig et al. US patent 5,978,835.**

As per claim 8, Ludwig teaches a method for manipulating digital video data comprising:

accessing digital audio-visual data (Multimedia documents), representing an audio-visual work and including data for a plurality of video frames (see col.28 lines 54-59, col.29 lines 19-22);

determining a start position for a frame data representing each of the frames (inherent from col.29 lines 19-22);

Art Unit: 2153

generating tag data including data representing the start position and other frame related data for each of the plurality of frames (apparent from fig.30 "structure and timing", col. 28 lines 15-30, col.29 line 54 to col.30 line 27).

storing the tag data separate from the digital audio-visual data (fig.30 "structure and timing", col.28 lines 19-25).

As per claims 81 and 83, it is inherent that Ludwig would have included time value for beginning and end of each frame (see col. 28 lines 15-30 and col.29 lines 54-57).

As per claims 82, it is apparent that Ludwig tag data referencing non-video data (col.28 lines 18-30).

As per claim 87, it is apparent that tag data is generated as the audio-visual work is displayed (i.e. as the multimedia document is being created or edited).

As per claim 88, Ludwig teaches saving the tag as separate file (fig.30 "structure and timing").

As per claim 89, Ludwig teaches the digital audio-visual data is stored in multiple storages (fig.30).

As per claims 90-91, Ludwig teaches the data is stored remote from where it is displayed over a network (fig.31A).

As per claims 120-123, they are rejected under similar rationale as for claims 88-83 above.

Art Unit: 2153

As per claims 127-131, they are rejected under similar rationale as for claims 87-91 above.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

*(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.*

**Claims 84-86 and 124-126 are rejected under 35**

**U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ludwig et al. US patent 5,978,835.**

As per claims 84-86 and 124-126, Ludwig does not teach MPEG data. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use MPEG because it is an efficient encoding for video data. It is well known in the art that MPEG has different types of frames.

**Claims 111-119 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ludwig et al. US patent 5,978,835 and further in view of Ramasubramanian et al. US patent 6,172,672.**

Art Unit: 2153

As per claims 111-114, Ludwig does not teach a method for streaming the audio-visual work. Ramasubramanian discloses a system for sending improved quality of streaming video data to a client, comprising the steps of: sending a video stream to said client in accordance with a set of streaming constraints, said video stream comprising at least a subset of video information from a first source (fig.1B, element 134); receiving a signal indicating a relaxation of said streaming constraints (col.6 line 25 - col.7 line 12); in response to said signal, accessing a set of improved quality video from a second source (fig.1B, element 140), said improved quality video information comprising an improved quality version of at least a subset of the video information in said video stream, wherein said improved quality video information includes a plurality of still images (a video stream is composed of frames, each frame being a single still image, also see col.8 lines 29-34 - the process described can be repeated to provide multiple copies of an image in the JPEG, PCX, BMP, TIFF, etc. formats); and sending said set of improved quality video information to said client (col.6 line 25 - col.7 line 12). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Ramasubramanian with Ludwig because it would have enable Ludwig to efficiently send the audio-visual work to remote user over a wide area network.

Art Unit: 2153

As per claim 115, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to preprocess the information to be stream because it would have reduced latency in providing the streaming data.

As per claims 116-118, Ramasubramanian teaches providing a signal indicating slower presentation rate and streaming to the client at an appropriate streaming rate (col.6 line 25 to col.7 line 12).

As per claim 119, Ramasubramanian teaches the signal including pause ("snapshot").

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dung Dinh whose telephone number is (703) 305-9655. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:00 AM - 4:30 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached at (703) 305-4792.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group 2100 Customer Service whose telephone number is (703) 306-5631.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, DC 20231

**or faxed to:** (703) 872-9306

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II,  
2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA, Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

  
Dung C. Dinh  
Primary Examiner